

**ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS AND POLICY REPORT
JOINT STATE AGENCY AND STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP
MEETING NOTES
September 15, 2003
1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
CSAC Video Conference Facility, Sacramento**

Welcome and Self-Introductions

By Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse (OPR)

- Welcome and thank you for attending this special meeting on EGPR goals and policies.

Review Agenda and Purpose of Meeting

By Terry Roberts

- Thanks to all who provided comments on the Context Chapter of the EGPR. OPR staff is wrapping up the Context Chapter this week, we will distribute the revised version to our advisors by the end of the week.
- Please send any last-minute comments on the Context Chapter to OPR by Wednesday, September 17.
- We are moving quickly to development of goals and policies, due to the expedited schedule for completion of the EGPR. A completed draft EGPR must be submitted to the Governor's Office for review on September 29.
- Review of handout materials distributed to the advisory groups last week: EGPR Outline, Guiding Principles Chapter, and Compilation of suggested Goals and Policies.
- EGPR Outline: The basic chapters remain the same, but the Context Chapter has been reorganized to include three new subsections: External Influences, Climate Change, and Opportunities for Innovation.
- Guiding Principles Chapter: This chapter establishes the theme of sustainable development as the EGPR's guiding principle. This is consistent with the idea that sustainable development is the backdrop to growth and development (see August 14 meeting minutes) and the requirement for the EGPR to be consistent with the 3 planning priorities of AB 857.
- The agenda today includes two breakout sessions, one to discuss broad goals and the second to discuss more specific policies to carry out those goals.
- At the request of the advisors, the second breakout session will be deleted, and we will have a large group discussion of both policies and implementation measures.
- Several advisors were gravely concerned about the expedited schedule for completion of the EGPR. Due to competing activities and schedules, many advisors have already been at a disadvantage and have not had the opportunity to provide adequate input to the EGPR. The new deadline of September 29 will prohibit any meaningful review or comment on the EGPR before it is submitted to the Governor's Office for review.

Introduction to Goals and Policies

By Brian Grattidge, State Clearinghouse (OPR)

Goals represent an end state, or ideal future condition. Examples of goals submitted by stakeholders and from relevant reports have been included in the agenda packet to inspire discussion.

Goals should also be:

1. State-oriented (things the State can do)
2. Consistent with the 3 planning priorities of AB 857
3. Grounded in the facts presented in the Context section
4. Translatable into an implementation plan ("measurable")
5. Cross-cutting (cut across issue areas and agency boundaries)

The breakout groups should identify goals, either new goals or based on the examples in the agenda packet. Stakeholders in each group should then identify their number one goal (for reporting and discussion purposes). All goals will be recorded in the minutes and considered.

Breakout Session on Goals

See attached transcript of notes from the five breakout groups.

Report Back on Goals

Each of the five breakout groups reported back on their "top" (most important) goals. These top goals are indicated in bold on the attached transcript of the breakout session.

Discussion of Policies and Implementation Measures

By Terry Roberts and Toni Symonds, Director of the Community Vitalization Unit

One broad goal was selected to be the subject of discussion. This broad goal shares some common ideas with many of the "top" goals identified during the earlier breakout session. It addresses the need for coordination among state agencies to improve delivery of services and to allow the state to work towards sustainable development in a consistent manner.

This goal forces us to ask the questions: How can entities of the state better work together as a government? How can we reduce conflicts between state entities and state policies? How can we achieve horizontal as well as vertical coordination among state agencies/entities?

Suggested policies and implementation measures for this goal include:

- Integration must be horizontal and vertical.
 - i.e. Caltrans district offices
- All agencies shall have a functional plan.
 - Change statutory definition of "functional plan".

- Agency requests to DOF for (infrastructure) funding must be consistent with EGPR (when applicable).
- Clarify relationship of various types of state plans:
 - Functional
 - Strategic
 - EGPR
- Consider relationship of regional (district) offices.
- Map effects of independent state action and compare to plans.
- Identify "signature" efforts (initiatives/projects) that further state goals (existing and proposed).
- Integrate state projects into regional planning.
- OPR shall review state proposals for consistency with EGPR.
- Reconstitute and utilize the Planning Advisory and Assistance Council (PAAC) to implement the EGPR.
- Develop an agency participation process.
- Seek coordination at the cabinet level.
- Measure cost- effectiveness for state actions.
- Create life cycle and full cost accounting.
 - Consider cost recovery
- Different means of finance require different criteria.
 - Different levels of decision making
- Track projects/funding that further goals.
- Infrastructure and services shall be located in the areas they serve.
 - LULU's
 1. Statewide benefit
 2. Incompatible with residential
- Is linear infrastructure comparable to AB 857 priorities? (Should AB 857 priorities be applied to linear infrastructure?)
- Take into account that broader planning efforts get the most response.
 - Do not over emphasize LULU's.
 - Coordinate better regional and sustainable processes.

There was a discussion about the need for goals to be achievable. On one hand, we want to set goals for the state that can truly be achieved, but on the other hand, a goal should be something that we strive towards and it is not always easily achievable.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Upcoming Meetings

- Wednesday, September 17, 1:00 pm at OPR: EGPR Rural Focus Group meeting.
- Thursday, September 18, at 10:00 am in Chico: Northern California Economic Recovery Team meeting. Toni Symonds of OPR will make a presentation on the EGPR.
- Wednesday, October 22, 1:30 pm: (tentative) EGPR Advisory Group meeting to review the complete draft EGPR.

OPR Action Items

- OPR will distribute the revised Context Chapter to advisors by Friday, September 19.
- OPR will distribute the draft chapters on Goals & Policies and Implementation next week.

Advisors Action Items

- Submit final comments on Context Chapter to OPR by Wednesday, September 17.
- Submit comments on Guiding Principles Chapter to OPR by Friday, September 19.

September 15, 2003 Meeting Participants

Barbara Alberson	Department of Health Services
Mitchell Baker II	Department of Transportation
Nick Bollman	California Center for Regional Leadership
Bryan Brock	State Water Resources Control Board
Dennis Castrillo	Department of Housing & Community Development
Barbara Cross	Department of Water Resources
Mary Ann Dickinson	California Urban Water Conservation Council
Tim Frank	Sierra Club
Randal Friedman	U.S. Navy
John Gamper	California Farm Bureau Federation
Robert Garcia	Center for Law in the Public Interest
Bill Geyer	Resource Landowners Coalition
Mary Pitto	Regional Council of Rural Counties
Jennifer Harris	Department of Finance
Rex S. Hime	California Business Properties Association
David Illig	Health and Human Services Agency
Brad Kane	Business, Transportation and Housing Agency
Julia Lave Johnston	California Research Bureau
Richard Lyon	California Building Industry Association
Bob Marr	Employment Development Department
Seth Miller	California Center for Regional Leadership
Valerie Nera	California Chamber of Commerce
Eileen Reynolds	California Association of Realtors
Rusty Selix	California Association of Councils in Government
Kurt Schuparra	California Environmental Protection Agency
Katie Shulte-Joung	California Urban water conservation Council
Julie Spezia	California Futures Network
Jack Striegel	Department of Mental Health
Ken Trott	Department of Food & Agriculture
Giselle Vigneron	State and Consumer Services Agency
Victor Weisser	California Council for Environmental & Economic Balance
Linda Wheaton	Department of Housing & Community Development

**Transcript of Notes from Breakout Sessions
September 15, 2003**

Each small group identified goals that should be included or considered in the EGPR. Some of these goals come from the handout entitled: "Suggested Goals and Policies for the EGPR, September 15, 2003." These goals are numbered for easy reference to the handout. Goals listed below without numbers were original ideas (not from the handout).

*Goals in **bold** type are those which were considered the "top" goals for each table.*

Yellow Table

Goal 4, modified as follows:

- **Add more detail to this goal (such as data component)**

Goal 28, modified as follows:

- **Collaboration among agencies is necessary. Must get state agencies to cooperate more closely**

Goal 36, modified as follows:

- **Impact on human health should be addressed in any environmental decision or environmental documents (e.g. EIR).**

Goal 39 ok as written.

Goal 46 ok as written.

Goal 47, modified as follows:

- **Include GIS for transportation system, otherwise, ok as is.**

Goal 59 ok as written.

Goal 2, modified as follows:

- **Too broad of a statement. Limit to cost effective infrastructure**

Goal 5, modified as follows:

- **Create schools that are environmentally sound. (Take out reference to development of children.)**

Goal 6, modified as follows:

- **Cost effective energy must be included. Cost effectiveness a priority in allocating /investing state resources.**

Goal 9, modified as follows:

- Conserve California's natural resources and use them efficiently

Goal 31, modified as follows:

- Encourage intergovernmental, collaboration, transparency, and accountability involving all levels of government.

Goal 34, modified as follows:

- Insert the terms "Devise/implement" rather than "remove" barriers.
- Encourage resolution of resource conflicts.

Green Table

Goal 9, modified as follows:

- **Goal #18 should be policy under #9**
- **Use resources efficiently**

Goal 10, modified as follows:

- **Change "Increase protection of California biodiversity..." to "Ensure protection of California biodiversity..."**

Goals #37- 39, 41-44 modified as follows:

- **All of these above goals should be listed as policies under one overarching housing goal.**
- **Define "infill"**

Goal 57, modified as follows:

- **Foster stewardship**

Goal 1, modified as follows:

- Alternative to #1: Achieve a more sustainable use of land and regional support which improves life.
- Recognize need to balance economy, environment, and equity.

Goal 3, modified as follows:

- Lacking goal: Inside schools or just phys.

Goal 33, modified as follows:

- Coordinate planning between mobility and accessibility

Goal 34, modified as follows:

- Remove barriers
- State should do good planning
- State will seek to implement policies that will internalize the social costs of sprawl.

Goal 40, modified as follows:

- Stewardship practices should be implemented both inside and outside redevelopment areas
- High ownership rates for all Californians is a priority
- Must address cost of building homes

Additional goals:

- Recognize the relationship between land use and environmental protection

Blue Table

- **Main Goal of Sustainable Development including the E's (Env, Econ, Equity)**
Goals stemming from this would be the priorities in AB857:
 - ❖ **Infill Development**
 - ❖ **Protect the Environment**
 - ❖ **Promote Efficient Development Patterns****And finally governance at the state, regional, local, and tribal level must coordinate to establish and implement the above goals.**
- **Coordination and Identification of Infrastructure including prisons, waste, water, energy etc...**
- **Goal 33, modified as follows:**
Coordination is a must among state, regional, local, and tribal land use planning.
- Must recognize that rural economies are full service economies.
- Sustainable development includes environmental and economic issues.
- Must have cost effective analysis of sustainable development.
- Housing should be affordable to all Californians and sustainably developed in conjunction with resource constraints of local jurisdiction.
- Must have coordination at local level with transportation planning and land use planning.
- Reward landowners instead of punishing them for sustainable development, stewardship, and conservation.
- Goal 28-Equity.
- Goal 5-Schools
- Goal 4-Regional Economies
- Impartial cost effective analysis of state actions and spending.

Orange Table

Goal 38, modified as follows:

- **All Californians should have access to safe, affordable housing. It is also important to locate housing near transportation. To the greatest extent feasible, housing should be located near jobs which represent similar incomes.**

Goals 4-8, 28, 31-32, 38, 46, 47, modified as follows:

- These goals must support sufficient use of land.

Goal 47, modified as follows:

- **California has a safe, sustainable transportation system that is environmentally sound, socially equitable, economically viable, and developed through collaboration; it provides for the mobility and access of people, goods services and information through an integrated, multimodal network. Through an integrative approach to transportation and land use planning, California uses land in an optimally efficient manner.**

Additional Goals

- Protect and conserve California's agricultural land and water resources. Includes food security and economic security (jobs/trade). Encourage provision of multiple natural resources.
- Include sustainability of farmland.
- Must have efficient transportation and land use.
 - Efficient land use to support food and housing.
- Greater coordination must occur among state agencies. Greater engagement with other agencies. Need processes to institutionalize coordination/education on policies/programs/services.
 - Early consultation among state agencies on state projects (CEQA process).
- Public education and engagement that leads to production of affordable housing.
- Encourage through incentives, projects that reuse existing infrastructure.
- Consolidation and coordination of state agency comments on CEQA documents.
 - Avoid inconsistency and redundancy among state agency comments
 - Ensure consistency of comments with EGPR
- Increase revenues to meet the well established infrastructure needs of our growing society.
- Protect and conserve California's agricultural land and water resources in order to meet the needs of future Californians for a secure, healthy and varied food supply; to support the state and national economies; and, provide the many public open space benefits of rural working landscape.
- Adopt a state agricultural plan to guide state investments in agricultural resource protection and economic development.
- Adopt CEQA guidelines that strengthen the assessment and mitigation of agricultural land impacts of development in California.
- Encourage a working landscapes approach to resource protection in California.
 - Approach should encourage private land stewardship for the production of food and fiber.
 - Provides market incentives for landowners to provide multiple public benefits such as flood plain protection, wildlife habitat, groundwater recharge, and recreation.
- Adopt state water policies that avoid the permanent or long-term retirement of agricultural lands and that adversely impact rural economies.

- Seek solutions that are flexible and accomplish multiple public benefits, including the conservation and profitability of agriculture lands.

Red Table

Goal 1, modified as follows:

- **Accountability:**
 - **State should track progress (return on investment).**
- **Cost effectiveness of State investments**
- **Safe development. Avoid natural and man made hazards i.e. urban and rural interface, flood plains, etc.**

Goal 2, modified as follows:

- **Choice – Plans need to offer choice in the market place. Improve transportation/housing choices**
- **Infill includes suburban infill.**
- **Align economic signals with goals.**

Goal 5, modified as follows:

- **Make urban areas competitive with suburban areas in offering schools, hospitals and transportation.**
 - **Process incentives**

Goal 6 as written.

Goal 8, modified as follows:

- **Health, welfare, and safety should be included.**
- **Rural economic activity (not a petting zoo).**
- **Cost effectiveness of all policies (i.e. Infill can be expensive).**
- **Do not be limited by 857. Make goals for expenditure of infrastructure.**

Additional Goal

- **Thoroughly evaluate public safety impacts of development.**